



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/746,619	12/21/2000	Steven D. Woods	7784-000156	1126

7590 11/30/2004
Harness, Dickey & Pierce, P.L.C.
P. O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303

EXAMINER

THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2161

DATE MAILED: 11/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/746,619	WOODS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hanh B Thai	2161	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 December 2000.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 28 and 29 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 21 December 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

Group I. Claims 1-27, drawn to a data management system of search input data, classified in class 707, subclass 3.

Group II. Claims 28-29, drawn to a software development and management system, classified in class 717, subclass 104.

Inventions II and I are related as combination and subcombinations. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination (I) as claimed does not require the particular of the subcombination II as claimed because it is a computer software development system that need not be input data and search the input data. Therefore, the inventions are distinct; however, they could be usable together.

2. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Election

Art Unit: 2161

3. During a telephone conversation with Mark D. Elchuk (Registration no. 33686) on November 9, 2004 a provisional election was made with traverse to prosecute the invention of group I, claims 1-27. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 28-29 withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Specification

4. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it is too long; it should be a single paragraph of 150 words or less. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Horovitz et al. (US Patent 6,389,409).

Regarding claim 25, Horovitz discloses a method for managing technologies among a plurality of individuals, the method comprising the steps of: populating a card catalog (col. 5, lines 47-54, Horovitz) over a networking connection based on collaboration input (col. 6, lines

Art Unit: 2161

36-37) from a steward (company A, Fig. 2, is equivalent to a steward); maintaining a bookshelf of links over the networking connection based on entries in the card catalog (col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz); and accessing the bookshelf based on search input from a user (col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43, Horovitz). Please note that “LinkGraph” corresponds to “card catalog”, “categories page” corresponds to “ “bookshelf of links”.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-24 and 26-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Horovitz et al. (US Patent 6,389,409) further in view of Wical (US Patent 6,487,545).

Regarding claim 1, Horovitz discloses a technology management system comprising:

- a web-based collaboration tool for populating a card catalog based on collaboration input (see col. 3, lines 54-57 and col. 5, lines 47-54, Horovitz). Please note that “Internet online catalog” is equivalent to web-based collaboration tool, “LinkGraph” is equivalent to card catalog and the “input received from a multiple information resources” reads on the collaboration input; and
- Fig. 2 of Horovitz teaches an “Internet site” that is equivalent to a web portal for maintaining a bookshelf of links to entries in the card catalog, the web portal further accessing the bookshelf based on search input catalog (see col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43 and col.6, lines 45-62, Horovitz).

Art Unit: 2161

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claim feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to scan the multiple information (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 2, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses that the collaboration input is generated by a steward (company A, Fig 2, is equivalent to a steward) and the search input is generated by a user (col. 4, lines 52-53 and col. 5, lines 40-43, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 3, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses that the collaboration tool retrieves the collaboration input directly from the steward (see col. 7, lines 35-38, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 4, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses that the collaboration tool retrieves the collaboration input from an electronic file, the steward placing the collaboration input in the electronic file (see col. 7, lines 35-41, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 5, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses that the collaboration tool converts the collaboration input into metadata, the collaboration input having a corresponding content (see col. 17, lines 17-21, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 6, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses “the category or the input” (col.6, line 36, Horovitz) corresponds to the keyword attribute information, the keyword attribute information defining keywords relating to the content.

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claim 7, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the collaboration tool further converts the technology-specific terminology data into metadata based on the collaboration input (see col. 7, lines 49-67, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 8, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the category or rank the link of the content that reads on the readiness attribute information, the readiness attribute information defining a readiness for linking of the content to the bookshelf (see col. 7, lines 16-18, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 9, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the metadata includes steward attribute information, the steward attribute information defining a responsible party for the content. The information about “company A” (Fig.2, Horovitz) corresponds to the steward attribute information.

Regarding claim 10, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the “company A” in Fig.2 of Horovitz that reads on author attribute information, the author attribute information defining an author of the content.

Regarding claim 11, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the metadata includes location attribute information, the location attribute information defining a file location of the content (see col. 6, lines 45-57, Horovitz). Please note that “URL” is the location information defining a file location of the content.

Regarding claim 12, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the metadata includes notification attribute information, the notification attribute information defining individuals to be notified of the conversion of the collaboration input into metadata (see col. 17, lines 17-21, Horovitz).

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claim 13, Horovitz/Wical combination does not disclose the security attribute information. But, it is obvious to obtain security requirements for accessing the content.

Regarding claim 14, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the metadata includes date attribute information, the date attribute information defining a conversion date for the collaboration input (see col. 8, lines 46-47, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 15, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the metadata includes title attribute information, the title attribute information defining a title for the content (see col. 6, line 59, Horovitz). "Catalog name" is equivalent to the title of the content.

Regarding claim 16, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the collaboration tool interacts with the card catalog over a networking connection (see Fig.2, Horovitz).

Regarding claims 17 and 20, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the networking connection is an Internet connection (see col. 5, lines 32-33, Horovitz).

Regarding claims 18 and 21, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the networking connection is an Intranet connection. Fig. 2 of Horovitz discloses that the system is connected to network. Thus, this connection can be an Internet or intranet connection.

Regarding claim 19, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the web portal interacts with the card catalog over a networking connection (see col. 5, lines 47-51, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 22. The management system of claim 1 wherein the web portal includes a user interface, the user interface being customizable based on interface input from a user (see col. 3, lines 34-38, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 23, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the user interface includes links contained in the bookshelf (see fig.2 and corresponding text, Horovitz).

Art Unit: 2161

Regarding claim 24, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses the terminology data relates to airplane technologies (see col. 47, lines 44-65, Wical). "Industry" term is one of many of the terms relate to various aspects of airplane manufacturing and design. Thus, the terminology data relates to airplane technologies.

Regarding claim 26, Horovitz discloses all of the claim limitation as discussed above, except the steps of storing technology-specific terminology data to a controlled lexicon.

Horovitz, however, does not disclose a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data. Wical, on the other hand, discloses a knowledge catalog processor accesses the knowledge catalog to classify input terminology (see abstract, col. 41, lines 25-53, Wical) that reads on a controlled lexicon containing technology-specific terminology data.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Horovitz to include the claim feature as taught by Wical. The motivation of doing so would have been to provide an efficient system that has an ability to scan the multiple information (see col. 2, lines 44-45, Horovitz).

Regarding claim 27, Horovitz/Wical combination further discloses that the steward is a member of a first collaboration group and the user is a member of a second collaboration group, the first and second collaboration groups being a part of an overall enterprise group (see col. 4, lines 50-62, Horovitz).

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

1. Wical (US 5,694,523) discloses a content processing system for discourse.

Art Unit: 2161

2. Khoyi et al. (US 5,634,124) disclose a data integration by object management.
3. Grate et al. (US 5,956,483) disclose a system and method for making function calls from a web browser to a local application.
4. Boguraev (US 6,212,494) discloses a method for extracting knowledge from online documentation and creating a glossary, index, help database or the like.
5. Lin et al. (Pub. 2002/0077919) disclose a method of collaboration commerce.
6. Brown et al. (US 5,923,552) disclose a system and methods for facilitating the exchange of information between separate business entities.
8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 571-272-4029. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 571-272-4023. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Hanh B Thai
Examiner
Art Unit 2161

Application/Control Number: 09/746,619

Page 10

Art Unit: 2161

November 17, 2004



UYEN LE
ARY EXAMINER